

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

GLEN COBB, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:14-cr-00194-APG-NJK

ORDER DENYING MOTION
FOR DISCOVERY AND INSPECTION

(Docket No. 38)

Pending before the Court is the motion for discovery and inspection filed by Defendants Glen Cobb, Charles Cobb, Anna Cobb and Monica Namnard. Docket No. 38. The Court has considered Defendants' motion, the United States' response, Defendants' reply and the United States' sur-reply.¹ Docket Nos. 38, 72, 84, 89. For the reasons discussed below, the Court hereby **DENIES** the motion for discovery and inspection.

On July 11, 2014, Defendants filed their motion for discovery and inspection to "preserve [their] Constitutional and statutory rights." Docket No. 38, at 2. They ask the Court to compel the United States to provide 25 separate categories of discovery. *Id.*, at 2-6. On July 25, 2014, after conferring with Defendants' counsel, the United States filed its Disclosure Statement, which sets forth the United States'

¹

The United States requests leave of court to file its sur-reply to address allegations regarding the status of discovery made by Defendants in their reply. Docket No. 89, at 2. The Court grants leave and allows the filing of the sur-reply.

1 position regarding discovery it agrees to provide. Docket No. 61.

2 On July 28, 2014, the United States responded to Defendants' motion for discovery and inspection.
3 Docket No. 72. The United States represents that it has agreed to timely produce all material required
4 under Fed.R.Crim.P. 16; *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963); *Giglio v. United States*, 405 U.S. 150
5 (1972); and 18 U.S.C. § 3500. The United States further represents that it has already produced all of the
6 material in its possession, including 22 specific categories of discovery material. *Id.*, at 2-3. The United
7 States further represents that it recognizes its continuing obligation with regard to the production of
8 disclosures and discovery. *Id.*, at 3.

9 On August 4, 2014, Defendants replied to the United States' response. Docket No. 84. In their
10 reply, they submit ten different specific items that they claim the United States has failed to produce. *Id.*,
11 at 2. In sur-reply, the United States submits that the items alleged have, in fact, been produced to
12 Defendants, and lists the dates on which each item was produced or made available. Docket No. 89, at
13 2-4. The United States further submits that, at this time, it does not intend to use any of those specific
14 items at trial. *Id.*, at 4. The Court finds that the United States has complied with its discovery obligations.

15 Accordingly,

16 Defendants' motion for discovery and inspection, Docket No. 38, is hereby **DENIED**.

17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 DATED: August 6, 2014.

19
20 

21 _____
NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge
22
23
24
25
26
27
28